REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated February 6, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 1-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as originally filed. Amendments to the Specification and Fig. 23 herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 17 based on informality. Amendments to claim 17 herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 6-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Amendments to the Specification and Claims herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 10-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), citing United States patent number 6,697,840 of Godefroid et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Godefroid et al. disclose presence awareness initiatives implemented in a collaborative system that enables a user to set presence awareness policies, and that provides a reasonably high assurance that the system will correctly implement those policies. The collaborative presence awareness system of Godefroid et al. enables users to specify presence awareness policies, and

includes tools to establish a level of assurance that the presence awareness system has the capability to implement correctly, substantially all possible presence awareness policies.

A user of the Godefroid et al. system can explicitly update his or her presence information by logging in or logging out. An implicit presence awareness change may occur in the Godefroid et al. system through sensors that detect and report the time-varying activities of a user, e.g., GPS (Global Positioning System) for user location tracking. Implicit presence awareness changes are modeled by Godefroid et al. through a screen saver that reports user screen activities. Specifically, when a user of the Godefroid et al. system has not been actively using input devices (e.g., mouse and keyboard) for a given period of time, a screensaver comes on. When the user of the Godefroid et al. system touches some input device after a period of inactivity, the screensaver goes off. Screensaver off and on events are automatically generated by the Godefroid et al. user interface for this purpose (column 5, lines 1-14).

Godefroid et al. further disclose that the user interface sends messages to the rest of a presence awareness system indicating login, logout, screensaver(on), and screensaver(off) events (column 5, lines 15-18).

In the Godefroid et al. system, a user may inquire about the presence of other users. These inquiries may relate to a user's interest in the login status of another user, the screen saver status of another user, whether another user is in a collaborative session, the other user's indicated willingness to interact (a "door" status), access rules and settings of the other user, and the other user's calendar, location, phone number, email address, and real name (in the case of anonymous participation). For these user activities, the Godefroid et al. user interface sends check-availability (X), check-name(X), check-chatters(X) messages to the rest of the presence awareness system, and receives available(X), unavailable(X), name(real(X), pseudo(Y)), and

chatters(SID, SetOfChatters) messages from the presence awareness system, where each chat session is identified by a globally unique id "SID".

Nowhere in Godefroid et al. is there disclosed or suggested any system or method of providing a user status message in an instant messaging system, including:

> obtaining a user status message associated with an owner user;
> sensing *a user request to edit said user status message*;
> providing *a user interface for editing said user status message, wherein said editing includes adding a new entry to said user status message*;
> inputting, through said user interface for adding said new entry to said user status message, information to include within said new entry; and
> adding said new entry to said user status message, wherein said adding said new entry includes inserting a time at which said new entry was added into said user status message. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. In contrast, Godefroid et al. disclose a system in which the user's presence information is automatically changed in response to either explicit or implicit events. Specifically, Godefroid et al. teach that user logins and logouts are explicit user actions resulting in automatic updates to presence information, while implicit events resulting in automatic presence information updates are the result of screen saver on and off events. Nothing in Godefroid et al. provides any hint or suggestion of even the desirability of providing any kind of *user interface for editing a user status message*, or for any *user editing of the user status message that adds a new entry to the user status message*, as in the present independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Godefroid et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Accordingly, Godefroid et al. does not anticipate claims 1, 7, 13 and 19.

In paragraphs 12-13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing the combination of Godefroid et al. and Pyra Labs ("Blogger"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Blogger discloses a system for creating Web pages referred to as "blogs" that are made up of chronologically arranged "posts". Like Godefroid et al., Blogger includes no teaching or suggestion regarding even a need for providing any kind of *user interface for editing a user status message*, or for any *user editing of the user status message that adds a new entry to the user status message*, as in the present independent claims 1, 7 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 7 and 13. Accordingly, the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to independent claims 1, 7 and 13. As claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15 each depend from claims 1, 7 and 13, they are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Godefroid et al. and Blogger for at least the same reasons.

In paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 4-6, 10, 11, and 16-18 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing Godefroid et al. and "Blogger", additionally combined with "Creation of Web Pages for the Internet" of Byford ("Byford"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Byford discloses a system for inserting words or text intended to act as hypertext in a paper page, and for recording URLs at the bottom of the page that match each link. A scanner and software are then used in Byford to produce and process digital input to produce Web pages. Like Godefroid et al. and Blogger, Byford includes no teaching or suggestion regarding even a need for providing any kind of *user interface for editing a user status message*, or for any *user*

editing of the user status message that adds a new entry to the user status message, as in the present independent claims 1, 7 and 13.   Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godefroid et al., Blogger and Byford does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 7 and 13.   Accordingly, the combination of Godefroid et al., Blogger and Byford does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to independent claims 1, 7 and 13. As claims 4-6, 10, 11, and 16-18 each depend from claims 1, 7 and 13, they are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Godefroid et al., Blogger and Byford for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

__May 9, 2007_____   _____/David A. Dagg/_____
Date   David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
                                    Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
                                    McGuinness & Manaras LLP
                                    125 Nagog Park
                                    Acton, MA 01720
                                    (617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-012